UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/705,686	11/10/2003	Leif N. Bowman	047711-0331	4638
23392 FOLEY & LAR	7590 04/30/200 RDNER	EXAMINER		
2029 CENTUR SUITE 3500	Y PARK EAST	STIGELL, THEODORE J		
LOS ANGELES	S, CA 90067		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3763	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			04/30/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/705,686	BOWMAN ET AL.	
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	THEODORE J. STIGELL	3763	
The MAILING DATE of this communication ap Period for Reply	pears on the cover sheet with the o	correspondence address	
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING Description of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1. after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statut Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tir will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the, cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. ED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
Status			
Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>08 F</u> This action is FINAL . 2b) ☑ This action is application is in condition for allowed closed in accordance with the practice under	s action is non-final. ance except for formal matters, pro		
Disposition of Claims			
4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-23,26-28 and 31-40 is/are pending 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdra 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1-23,26-28 and 31-40 is/are rejected 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	awn from consideration.		
Application Papers			
9) The specification is objected to by the Examin 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accomposed and applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examin	cepted or b) objected to by the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. Section is required if the drawing(s) is ob	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). jected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).	
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority document 2. Certified copies of the priority document 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Bureat* See the attached detailed Office action for a list	nts have been received. Its have been received in Applicat Pority documents have been receive Tau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	ion No ed in this National Stage	
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail D 5) Notice of Informal F 6) Other:	ate	

Art Unit: 3763

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

Applicant's arguments, see Remarks, filed 2/8/2008, with respect to the rejection(s) of claim(s) 1-14, 26-27, 31-38, and 40 under 102(b) over Kihara et al. (6,579,265) have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made in view of the reference cited below.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1-23 and 31-40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Larsen et al. (6,736,797). Larsen discloses an infusion set (see the embodiment shown in Figures 20-33) comprising a base (40), a cannula (49) connected to and extending away from the base, a connector (55) removably attached to the base, and a tube (57) affixed to the connector, wherein the connector is rotatable on the base to more than 5 degrees while the cannula is at a subcutaneous position and limited to less than 360 degrees around an axis that is substantially perpendicular to the base, wherein the connector comprises multiple stop surfaces (66, see at least Figures 32-33) for

Art Unit: 3763

inhibiting rotation beyond 360 degrees, and a contiguous passage for passing fluids is formed from the tubing to the cannula when the connector is removably attached to the base, wherein the base comprises multiple barriers spaced around the perimeter of the base (sides of 47) and extending from the surface of the base, wherein the barriers restrict the movement of the stops, wherein the rotation is limited to less than 30 degrees, further comprising a needle hub (58,59) and an adhesive pad (61). In regards to claims 31 and 34, the connector (55) can be attached to the base in at least two different positions.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* **v.** *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

- 1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
- 2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
- 3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
- 4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claims 26-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Larsen et al. (6,736,797). The examiner contends that the connector of Larsen can rotate to about 10 degrees, but if

Application/Control Number: 10/705,686 Page 4

Art Unit: 3763

the applicant disagrees, the examiner maintains that the degree of rotation is a matter of design choice. In paragraph [0056] on page 11, the applicant discloses that multiple degrees of rotation are contemplated including at least 2 degrees, 5 degrees, 7.5 degrees, and 10 degrees. The applicant has not shown that one rotational arrangement works better than any other rotational arrangement. Therefore, the examiner maintains that the degree of rotation is a matter of design choice that fails to patentably distinguish over the prior art.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to THEODORE J. STIGELL whose telephone number is (571)272-8759. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nicholas Lucchesi can be reached on 571-272-4977. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number: 10/705,686 Page 5

Art Unit: 3763

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Theodore J Stigell/ Examiner, Art Unit 3763

/Matthew F DeSanto/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3763